REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Entry of the above amendments, and reconsideration of the claim rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-21 remain in the application. In this Response, claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12, 15-17, and 19 have been amended. Claims 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 14 remain in their form as originally filed.

The amendments submitted above to certain claims have been done so either in response to the Examiner's rejections or objections. No new matter has been introduced through any of these claim amendments.

A. Interview Summary

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Nguyen for the telephone interview that was held on June 12, 2008. A summary of the meeting is as follows:

Proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 8, and 15, which were sent to Examiner Nguyen via facsimile prior to the telephone interview, were discussed. Examiner Nguyen indicated that the amendment would likely overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) reference to Gensel, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0200532 A1. Applicant agreed to set forth arguments to this effect in this response, which arguments are presented below.

B. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Item 2 In The Office Action

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gensel, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0200532 A1.

In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 to more distinctly distinguish Applicant's invention through the further limitations of:

(Claim 1)

"receiving a relative resource identifier from the application source file indicating a resource to be utilized by the application, wherein the relative resource identifier does not indicate a protocol or a location for the resource;

locating the resource based on the relative resource identifier and the code generated during compilation of the application; and"

(Claim 8)

"a memory coupled with and readable by the processor and containing a series of instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to generate a code by compiling an application source file and a project file of the application source file and to receive a relative resource identifier from the application source file indicating a resource to be utilized by the application, wherein the relative resource identifier does not indicate a protocol or a location for the resource, and to locate the resource based on the relative resource identifier and the code generated during compilation of the application, and return the resource to the application."

(Claim 15)

"receiving a relative resource identifier from the application source file indicating a resource to be utilized by the application, wherein the relative resource identifier does not indicate a protocol or a location for the resource;

locating the resource based on the relative resource identifier and the code generated during compilation of the application; and"

Support for these amendments may be found in the specification on page 2, lines 9-12, and page 4, line 22 through page 5, line 10 and in reference to FIG. 1. The resource loader allows applications to be written using relative URIs (relative source identifier) rather than fully qualified URIs. (*See* page 2, lines 11-12) "The application **110** contains only a relative URI to the resource **125** for use within the application **110**." (*See* page 5, lines 9-10) Applicant submits that Gensel does not teach nor suggest this additional limitation.

Gensel is directed to a "system that facilitates sharing a reusable code base that includes genericized, automatically customizable software components." (See Abstract)

System **100** facilitates sharing a reusable code. A build collection and action tool **110** interacts with a project file **120** to facilitate determining which files and/or rules to collect and how to collect the files and/or rules into a project build directory **130**. (See paragraph 0037) "The project file **120** can also identify items located in a reusable code base. Thus, the project file **120** interacts with a core file **160,** a core component **170,** core source files **180,** and/or third party components **190.** The interaction may be direct or indirect using, for example, the core file **160** to achieve indirection. In one example, the project file **120** identifies which core file **160** and/or core components **170** to include in a project." (See paragraph 0042) "Files that support include syntax may maintain a link with a core source file **180** rather than copying the core source file **180** to the build directory **130.** Thus, when changes are made to a core source file **180,** the change can be propagated efficiently, in a timely manner, to the build directories **130** where a copy of the file and/or a link to the file is located." (See paragraph 0048)

This is where Applicants invention differs from Gensel, because Gensel teaches the use of fully qualified URIs, and not relative URIs. "Referring now to **FIG. 9,** information can be transmitted between various computer components associated with systems and methods that facilitate reusing a shareable code base described herein via a data packet **900.** An example data packet **900** is shown. The data packet **900** includes a header field **910** that includes information such as the length and type of packet. A source identifier **920** follows the header field **910** and includes, for example, an address of the computer component from which the packet **900** originated. Following the source identifier **920,** the packet **900** includes a destination identifier **930** that holds, for example, an address of the computer component to which the packet **900** is ultimately destined. Source and destination identifiers can be, for example, **globally unique identifiers, URLS (uniform resource locators), path names, and the like** (*emphasis added*). The data field **940** in the packet **900** includes various information intended for the receiving computer component." (See paragraph 0076) Gensel teaches storing the fully qualified URIs in the data packet from the source file. Applicant's invention stores a relative resource identifier (relative URI) in the application source file. Code is generated during compilation that processes the relative source identifier and returns the resource to the application. (*See* page 4, lines 22-23 in the specification) With Gensel,

the fully qualified URI must be updated prior to the build operation in order for the resource to be locatable. This is the exact problem that Applicant recognized and has solved. "Generally speaking, the resource loader allows applications to be written using relative URIs rather than fully qualified URIs. During execution, applications may initiate execution of the resource loader that in turn locates and returns the resource to the application. In this way, applications may be written that are agnostic as to how their resources are packaged. That is, a change of resource packaging does not necessitate a re-write of the application source code." (See page 2, lines 10-15 in the specification) Gensel is plagued with the problem that Applicant has solved. Gensel does allow for code to be reused from project to project, but fully quailed URIs are required under the teaching of Gensel.

Since the Gensel reference does not disclose expressly or inherently all of the elements and limitations of Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15, Applicant believes that these claims are not anticipated by Gensel and requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 8 and 15 and include all the elements and limitations thereof. As a result, and in light of the foregoing remarks concerning independent claims 1, 8 and 15, Applicant likewise believes that dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 also overcome the Examiner's rejection based on Gensel under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and withdrawal of that rejection in respect to these claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed on April 8, 2008. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicant believes the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Thus, a bona-fide attempt has been made to ensure that the application meets all statutory requirements and is in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early indication to that effect is, therefore, courteously solicited.If a telephone conference would expedite allowance or resolve any additional questions, such a call is invited at the Examiner's convenience.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due with this response. If this is not the case, please charge all required fees, or fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17, or all required extension of time fees due, or credit any overpayment to, deposit account 13-2725. Please consider this a Petition For Extension Of Time for a sufficient number of months to enter this correspondence, or any future reply, if appropriate, for an extension of time for its timely submission.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(303) 357-1632

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

By: 
Stanley J. Gradisar, Esq., Reg. No. 42,598
Attorney for Applicant

Date: July 8, 2008